

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 were pending in the above-identified application when last examined. Claim 1-5 and 7-9 are rejected. Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

### **Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boscha (US 2002/0136504). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is axiomatic that “[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration.” *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. V. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The Examiner states:

Regarding the limitation of a fiber optic connector, the specification does not particularly define “a fiber optic connector,” thus in the broadest interpretation the optical fiber would be considered a fiber optic connector...

(See Current Office Action, pages 2 & 3)

Applicants respectfully disagree that the specification does not particularly define a “a fiber optic connector”. Applicants further disagree that an optical fiber would be

considered a fiber optic connector. The specification of the application describes a ceramic ferrule 310 carrying an optical fiber 312. The ceramic ferrule 310 and the optical fiber 312 comprise the fiber optic connector 307 (specification of the application, pg. 4, paragraph 25 and Figure 21). Therefore the specification defines an fiber optic connector 307 as comprising an optical fiber 312 and a ceramic ferrule 310. Because the specification defines an fiber optic connector 307 as comprising an optical fiber 312 and a ceramic ferrule 310, an optical fiber 312 may not be considered a fiber optic connector 307.

In the present case, not every feature of claims 1 and 2 are represented in the Boscha reference. Applicants respectfully submit that Boscha does not disclose a sleeve defining only one bore with an inner surface having a constant inner diameter for receiving and contacting outer surfaces of an alignment feature and a ferrule of a fiber connector when the alignment feature and the ferrule are inserted into the bore at opposite ends of the bore so they can be aligned relative to each other.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Boscha does not anticipate Applicants' claims 1 and 2. Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Regarding claim 3, the Examiner considers the glass ferrule (24) of Boscha to be a cylindrical post having a hole allowing light emitted by the package to pass (Current Office Action, pg. 3). Applicants respectfully disagree. Labeled feature (24) shown in

Figure 1 may be considered a sleeve but it is not an alignment feature as described in claim 3 of this application. For at least the above reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Boscha does not anticipate Applicants' claim 3. Therefore, for at least the above reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Regarding claim 5, dependent claim 5 further defines patentably distinct independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 5 is also believed to be allowable. For at least the above reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

### **Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boscha in view of Gilliland et al. (US 6,416,238 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dependent claims 4 further defines patentably distinct independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 4 is also believed to be allowable. For at least the above reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boscha in view of Freeman (US 5,195,156). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dependent claims 7-9 further define patentably distinct independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 7-9 are also believed to be allowable. For at least the above reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims (1-5 and 7-9) are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

July 31, 2009

/John Pessetto/

John R. Pessetto, Reg. No. 48,369  
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.  
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Tel. (303) 298-9888  
Fax (303) 297-2266